

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 17 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansell et al. (Mansell) in view of Eslaminovin, and claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansell in view of Eslaminovin and further in view of Gilmore.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

As explained in Applicant's previous Amendment filed October 28, 2003, one of the features of Applicant's claim 1 is an anti-theft service center for receiving a notice from a vehicle notifying device and for sending a theft signal through a communication channel corresponding to the subscriber ID of the vehicle-theft notifying device to the stolen vehicle in response to the notice.

The Examiner alleges that Mansell, in Fig. 15, discloses "a vehicle registration system having a plurality of communication channels respectively assigned to subscriber IDs (mobile units)". Also, the Examiner alleges that Mansell, at col. 22, lines 35-44, discloses "an anti-theft service center for ... sending a theft signal through one of the communication channels corresponding to the subscriber ID of the one of the vehicle-theft notifying devices to the stolen vehicle in response to the notice". (See Office Action, paragraph 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Fig. 15 of Mansell illustrates nothing more than “[t]he “CALL STATUS” window [which] includes a list of active vehicles” such that “[a] typical CALL STATUS menu shows for each vehicle number V10, V11 a mobile ID number (such as a telephone number) and a Call Type (showing an alarm or other condition)” (see col. 28, lines 13-57). While Mansell describes a system where mobile ID numbers are associated with each vehicle, nowhere does Mansell disclose, teach or suggest a plurality of communication channels respectively assigned to subscriber IDs, as alleged by the Examiner.

On the other hand, col. 22, lines 35-44, of Mansell states:

If a command has been received from the Control Center, the Mobile Unit controller branches to one of several routines based on the particular command, indicated by "branch on command" block 1338.

If the Control Center command was to take control of the vehicle in some way, such as by activating a relay to disable the vehicle, blink its lights, or sound its alarm horn, control passes to block 1340. Block 1340 is a generalized representation of the possible control actions which the Control Center may exert upon the vehicle. Thus, according to the present invention, the Control Center is not merely a passive observer of the vehicle, but may remotely control aspects of its operation.

Mansell describes nothing more than the general capability of a “Control Center” of its system to remotely control aspects of operation of a vehicle via a “Mobile Unit” installed on the vehicle. Contrary to the Examiner’s analysis, nowhere does Mansell disclose, teach or suggest that its Control Center sends signals through one of the communication channels corresponding to the subscriber ID of its Mobile Unit.

That is, contrary to the Examiner’s analysis Mansell discloses nothing more than a conventional two-way communication between its Control Center and Mobile Units via a

“communication link (e.g., cellular telephone) 110” or the like (see Fig. 1, and col. 7, lines 13-16). Mansell does not disclose, teach or suggest a system where an anti-theft service center for receiving a notice from one of the vehicle notifying devices and for sending a theft signal through one of the communication channels corresponding to the subscriber ID of said one of the vehicle-theft notifying devices to the stolen vehicle in response to the notice, as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Eslaminovin and Gilmore, which the Examiner cites for the alleged teachings of means for “inhibiting an engine of the vehicle,” do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Mansell.

Therefore, Applicant’s independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 (which incorporate all the novel and unobvious features of their base claim 1) would not have been obvious from any reasonable combination of Mansell, Eslaminovin and Gilmore at least for these reasons. Applicant’s independent claim 17 is patentable over Mansell, Eslaminovin and Gilmore for the reasons that are similar to the reasons presented above.

Furthermore, none of the cited prior art references discloses, teaches or suggests the feature of an anti-theft apparatus inhibiting an engine of a vehicle from restarting in response to reception of a theft signal only when the vehicle is stopped, as recited in Applicant’s dependent claim 2.

The Examiner acknowledges that Mansell does not disclose such a feature, and relies on Eslaminovin to supply this acknowledged deficiency, citing col. 3, lines 1-30 and col. 5, lines 1-33 of Eslaminovin (see Office Action, paragraph 3). However, close review of Eslaminovin’s disclosure in its entirety, and particularly the portions cited by the Examiner, controverts the

Examiners position. In particular, at col. 3, lines 1-30, Eslaminovin describes nothing more than a general concept of a system which “enables vehicle operators to disable a vehicle via hidden switches” (see also Fig. 1). On the other hand, at col. 5, lines 1-33, Eslaminovin describes a system which intentionally allows the vehicle engine to be disabled while the vehicle is moving:

The vehicle owner may actually be driving the vehicle when an incident occurs that causes distress for the operator, such as a heart attack, carjacking, or someone aggressively following the vehicle. In the case of an incident such as a heart attack, the operator may be not be able to safely stop the vehicle and may wish to disable the vehicle in which case one would merely need to depress a hidden internal switch electrically connected to switch 38 to deactivate the ignition switch

Thus, Eslaminovin teaches away from Applicant’s claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art references for this additional reason.

Finally, Applicant notes that one of the exemplary, non-limiting benefits which may be achieved by the Applicant’s invention is anti-theft service center of the present invention sending the theft signal only to the stolen vehicle without having any verbal information on the stolen vehicle from the user of the vehicle-theft notifying device.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/929,286

Atty Dkt No. Q65836

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stan Torgovitsky
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 22, 2004